

the society died for lack of funds. It lasted six years (1880-1886). The president died in 1890, at the age of seventy-eight; the pale agnostic took his own life through conjugal unhappiness;* and doubtless a large proportion of the congregation are now no more.

"My joining this church gave great offence to the local Society of Friends, and I resigned my birthright membership. But at the end of one year I also resigned from the church, though attending their meetings and even addressing them after my withdrawal. I have never had a spiritual home in the quarter of a century that has since elapsed. The year's experience convinced me that some belief in the spiritual or supernatural was a *sine qua non* for a church. I regarded the society as a good debating club, but vigorously denied that it could ever be a church.

This conviction I still hold, but see as yet no solution. The Hicksite Friends (whose meeting in Germantown I have been attending for the past year) are the nearest approach to my ideal. But they hold on to certain expiring remnants of seventeenth-century thought that make them fall short of my wish. I crave for the silence of worship, and resent much of the speaking, especially of women. (This is not true, however, of my own meeting, where Joseph Wharton, the well-known iron-master, is the chief speaker—a man of strong sense, hale old age and advanced ideas.) My own conviction is that worship and speaking should not be mixed. The only vehicles of worship are silence and music, music and silence. (Music of course the Quakers taboo.) There ought to be some plan whereby those wanting to hear discourses and those wanting to meditate or pray should be either in separate rooms at the same time or else in the same room at different times. This problem has agitated me for years. Neither the Hicksite Friends, the Unitarians, nor the Ethical Culture societies have solved it."

HINDUISM DIFFERENT FROM BUDDHISM.

We have repeatedly received letters to the effect that it would be desirable to call attention to the fact that Buddhism, Brahmanism and Theosophy are three different things and should not be confused.

Brahmanism is the religion of ancient India, and is commonly called Hinduism when referred to in its modern form. The sacred book of the Brahmans is the Vedas, and it has found its highest philosophical explanation in the Vedanta. The main doctrine of Brahmanism is the theory of self or *atman*, which may briefly be characterized as the thing-in-itself in the domain of psychology. The Upanishads presented this philosophy in the form of dialogues or discourses which are most attractively written and contain many deep thoughts, but they are permeated with the spirit of a metaphysical psychology which sees in the *atman*, the soul which controls all physical and mental activity. This *atman* is finally identified with the *atman* of the entire world, and so the Vedanta philosophy has been worked out into psychical pantheism.

Buddhism is the very opposite to the Vedanta conception of Brahmanism. Buddha denied the existence of the *atman*, and the doctrine of the *an-atman* is one of the corner stones of his religion. In fact Buddha based his ethics

* He once said on the platform (combating the orthodox idea that religion was necessary to happiness): "A certain amount of happiness is a necessity to existence."

of selfless love upon the illusory nature of a self in-itself. Buddhism does not teach a transmigration of the self, but a reincarnation of the same kind of being. Buddha's conception of philosophy is sufficiently characterized by the word "Name-and-Form," which means person. There is no person in itself, and consequently there is no migrating of an atman at the moment of death.

Buddha's philosophy stands practically on the same ground as modern psychology, which is frequently, but erroneously, called a psychology without a soul. It is a special merit of Buddha that in spite of his negation of the atman, he insisted very vigorously on the idea of immortality, only his conception of the soul and of the reappearance of personality, differed from the Brahman view. Buddhist scriptures compare the reappearance of the same form to the seed of a plant such as the banana. There is not a particle of the banana seed that migrates to the new fruit, and yet the seed that is placed in the ground and undergoes the solution, reappears in the fruit as a new incarnation although no atman of the seed migrates from the old seed to the new seed.

We need not add any further comment on theosophy. Theosophy is a movement which contains a great ideal, that of harmonizing all faiths into one comprehensive brotherhood of mankind. Though this is a noble and good ideal, we must know at the same time that the different societies are dominated by the spirit of their leaders, especially Madame Blavatsky, and many theories creep in which are commonly accepted by all enthusiastic theosophists, which are scarcely tenable before a critical tribunal. Theosophy and Buddhism have been identified by Mr. Olcott, and we do not doubt that in his conception the two merge into one. Without controverting the personal conception of Mr. Olcott, whose Buddhist chapters contain many good thoughts, we wish to state that Buddhists of Ceylon, especially the Anagarika Dharmapala protest against their identification.

We have hesitated to make this statement, because we thought that the difference between Buddhism, Brahmanism, and Theosophy is sufficiently known, but we are surprised that in such a good periodical as *Public Opinion* (Feb. 10, 1906) an article under the title "First Hindu Temple in America," with pictures of the temple itself and the portrait of its founder, Swami Trigunatita, explaining that he teaches the Vedanta, should bear in big lettering under the portrait the inscription "Head of the *Buddhist* Temple in San Francisco," while the place of his worship is called "Home of the *Buddhist* Cult on the Pacific Coast." This statement will cause some confusion, for there is a Buddhist mission in San Francisco, which is conducted by Japanese priests, their headquarters being 807 Polk Street.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

Heinrich Hensoldt has published a German pamphlet under the title of *Annie Besant, eine wunderliche Heilige*. It seems to be for private circulation only, since there is no publisher mentioned, and the subject matter is rather personal. Mr. Hensoldt has met Madame Blavatsky personally, and he denounces her in very unequivocal terms as a fraud. He states that she spoke to him unreservedly, and invited him to associate himself with her for the outspoken purpose of duping the credulous; but the main contents of the